
Appendix B-1. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 13, 2004 Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
<p>October 13, 2004 CPUC Building San Francisco, CA 10:30 am – 1:30 pm</p>	<p><u>Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEQA requires that projects not be analyzed in a piece-meal manner and, therefore, the project's potential to extend the life of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant should be considered. This issue should be acknowledged in the purpose of the project. • One of the purposes of this project is to provide power services to the PG&E service area. However, there are other ways to develop and provide power to this area. All alternatives analyzed should be analyzed; if environmentally superior alternatives are found they must be put forth. • This application should be considered as part of a resource alternatives analysis. The long-term resource plans being developed by the CPUC and utilities should be used to develop possible alternatives to the project. • There are significant societal risks associated with extending the life of a nuclear power plant. Some of these risks include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seismic Hazards Around the DCPD Facility. The science surrounding seismicity is an evolving science. The current knowledge and technologies of this field are much different than that which was available when analyses were originally done for DCPD. Current standards and technology should be used to determine the area's seismic hazards. ▪ Terrorism Threats to the DCPD Facility. Currently, terrorism threats to nuclear facilities are real risks. This risk needs to be studied in more detail. A terrorism strike at this facility would result in many environmental and public health and safety effects. Studies must be done to analyze these potential effects and analyses must show that these effects can be mitigated. ▪ Cumulative Impacts. Cumulative impacts need to be addressed specifically and broadly. Studies document detrimental impacts on the marine environment in the DCPD area. A marine analysis must be done in a cumulative perspective. This analysis must not use the current conditions as a baseline to move forward from, but rather analyze the incremental damage done by DCPD from the beginning of its operation. The marine environment is just one example of the need for cumulative impact analysis. <p><u>Questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the EIR contractor and CPUC going to develop and analyze alternatives? You mentioned that the general public and other interested parties would have the opportunity to comment and contribute to the development of alternatives, however these entities are not experts in the field. • Development of alternatives is important to this project. Important alternatives to this project include the provision of energy services to the PG&E service area. Do you have any experts that are able to provide energy services policy alternatives? • Can the general public attend the aforementioned "Alternatives Summit"? • These scoping meetings are a way to meet face-to-face with the lead agency and those preparing the document; are there other opportunities for the general public to meet with these parties and learn about the status of the project? • How is the applicant involved in the process? • On March 4, 2004, the CPUC, Energy Division issued a deficiency notice to PG&E. What is the status of this notice, and have there been any other requests made to the applicant? • Are you doing a cost-benefit analysis?

Appendix B-2. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 27, 2004 Afternoon Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
<p>October 27, 2004 SLO Co. Library San Luis Obispo, CA 2:30 – 4:30 pm</p>	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Luis Obispo voted for Prop 9, which allows the CPUC to regulate the nuclear and power industry. The status of resulting regulations needs to be discussed. • There is concern over the biological effects of the nuclear industry and radiation. • Preparation and format of the scoping meeting was poor; there was no transcription, tape recording, or official record of the meeting. • The EIR should use the California Energy Action Plan as guidance and as a source for ideas for the 'No Project' Alternative. • New seismic data and information has been discovered since 1991. This information should be included in the EIR. • There is a thrust fault that lies approximately 3 miles offshore of DCPD and an earthquake at this fault could be felt at DCPD. In addition, there may be a fault at the coastline that could also affect DCPD. • DCPD is only designed for 0.5/0.7 G horizontal acceleration, however acceleration of earthquakes at a thrust fault can be significantly larger (> 1G) and can include vertical acceleration as well. • Seismicity is within the NRC's jurisdiction, however they said it is not a problem. The NRC does not want to evaluate the DCPD design to determine if it is safe given new seismic information. The NRC has ignored seismic security issues, and these issues should be investigated. • There would be three air quality impacts from this project including fugitive dust, commuter vehicle emission, and combustion emissions from construction equipment. There is a need to quantify the air emissions for the two proposed offloading and transport options. The DCPD Intake Cove is the preferred option, however if Port San Luis is selected SLO APCD would request a human health risk assessment due to inhalation risks. There would be cumulative air quality impacts with the Unocal project in Avila Beach. PG&E should consult with SLO APCD to find an equitable impact analysis, and to determine the air quality background sections and permit issues. The EIR should address operational emissions due to a possible extension of life of DCPD. PG&E must fully mitigate operational emissions. • There is concern with the water quality associated with the cooling water outflow due to chlorides placed in the cooling water system. • Traffic impacts in the area and at the plant are significant. A busing program should be utilized that allowed employees to be bused from an off-site location to DCPD using low-emission vehicles. • This project is being compartmentalized or segmented, and other 'future' projects including waste storage, security enhancements, and turbine replacement will not be considered with the current project. Segmentation of the proposed project would allow it to seem that there are no significant impacts • Thank you for extending the scoping comment period. • The comment period should be extended. • PG&E has three objectives for this project include safe, reliable and cost-efficient energy; nuclear power does not satisfy any of these goals. However, nuclear power is unsafe due to radiological hazards, has no reliable waste storage or disposal, and is expensive with added costs of regular maintenance and unexpected parts replacement. • The scope of the NOP is too narrow because it does not include the potential extension of DCPD's operating life through a NRC license renewal and the operating risks and cumulative impacts associated with extended operations. • Extension of the operating life of DCPD would increase the amount of nuclear waste and the need for disposal. • The NOP must be expanded to include additional 'No Project' alternatives and the potential for the extension of life of DCPD. • The baseline for this project should include the added impacts of a longer operation due to extension of plant life. • The DCPD evacuation plan is inadequate. The warning sirens do not provide enough warning to close residents or hikers/campers in the area.

Appendix B-2. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 27, 2004 Afternoon Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The siren can not be heard in all locations, specifically in some of the canyons near DCP. Preparation of a map where the sirens can not be heard would be a good idea.• If this project is approved and the operation of DCP is extended, the DCP evacuation plan must be reevaluated.• DCP is becoming a nuclear waste dump with the recently approved ISFSI project, and the original steam generator storage for this project.• No one has ever been killed at a nuclear power plant.• The current 'No Project' alternatives are insufficient. Use the long-term resource plans completed by CPUC and the utilities as a source of additional alternatives and information.• There is a legal obligation to fully describe the alternatives including the 'No Project' alternatives.• Alternative power generation, as addressed in the 'No Project' alternatives, should be directed by California state energy policy, which states the following in priority order as focus areas for energy investment:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ energy efficiency;▪ renewable and distributive generation;▪ conventional energy; and▪ transmission and distribution upgrades.Nuclear power, and therefore DCP, is not consistent with this policy. This project needs to be justified in order to continue.• Nuclear power is a low-cost and reliable form of electricity generation.• The 'No Project' alternatives should also consider electricity conservation, and renewable and alternative power generation sources such as wind, solar, and thermal depolymerization (waste-to-energy).• The 'No Project' alternatives should consider replacement generation, and a combination of replacement transmission and generation. Consider "re-purposing" the DCP facility in which the existing power infrastructure at the site would be converted for use as a natural gas co-generation facility. This has been done or is being proposed at two non-active nuclear power plants in Midland and Van Buren County, Michigan. The remaining power not generated by these facilities could be made up with conservation and an experimental multi-mode power generation facility utilizing solar, wind, and tidal power.• There are socioeconomic and environmental justice issues with the current evacuation plan. The EIR must determine all environmental impacts, which includes social cost, of evacuation plans. The plan is built upon the idea that all people have personal transportation; however there are no plans for children, those without cars, houseless, and prisoners.• Currently there are no cost-effective methods to generate electricity through alternative energy.• Accumulating spent fuel in the waste pools and future storage of spent fuel in dry casks for the ISFSI project are concerns.• The reracking of the spent fuel rods at a higher density than designed for the spent fuel pools is a concern. This increases the risk of fire. Spent fuel pools are now more radioactive than the reactors.• On-site storage of spent fuel is cost effective form of storage.• Nuclear power is now the most expensive form of energy when construction, operation, and maintenance are included. Nuclear power requires a great deal of government oversight and is funded through ratepayers.• There is a need to use science, and not opinion, to inform the decisions and decision-makers.• The NRC refused to evaluate terrorism issues, but this must be analyzed in the EIR. <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How does the CPUC record comments?• How willing are you to change this EIR document?• Why is steam generator manufacturing being outsourced?

Appendix B-3. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 27, 2004 Evening Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
<p>October 27, 2004 SLO Co. Library San Luis Obispo, CA 7:00 – 9:00 pm</p>	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Price-Anderson Act limits nuclear power plant operators liability to only a small percentage of nuclear accidents, including those due to terrorism. • There is no corporate liability for nuclear power plant operators as evidenced by the lack of corporate response during a recent release of radioactive steam at a New Jersey nuclear power plant. • For an investment of approximately \$700 million, the EIR should include terrorism, seismic, and containment issues. • The ratepayers should not have to pay for this project. • This project is a waste of resources and money. • This project will cost the ratepayers too much money. • This project will have long-term economic impacts on ratepayers. All of the below replacement projects, repairs, and maintenance work will result in more damage and costs to ratepayers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction of dry cask storage will cost \$325 million. ▪ Replacement of turbine blades will cost over \$100 million. ▪ Replacement of reactor head will cost in the \$10s of million. ▪ Replacement of pumps, valves, and other parts will cost \$10s of millions. ▪ There is a likelihood of other failing components, construction projects and repairs whose costs are grossly underestimated. These include safety upgrades, unforeseen repairs, and additional maintenance needed if plant operating life is extended due to this project. • PG&E is not revealing the true cost of operating DCCP. • Some ratepayers would be happy to pay higher rates to eliminate the risks associated with nuclear power generation at DCCP. • The issue of continued maintenance that is required for long-term waste disposal should be included in the EIR. • The NOP is too narrow because it only considers the construction of the proposed project. It should analyze the larger, broader scope that includes the long-term risks and costs of extending the operating life of DCCP as would be made possible by this project. • The NOP must be reissued with an expanded scope that includes extension of life and the long-term effect of radioactive waste storage. • The NOP must consider human health and the costs, risks and problems caused by DCCP. • The current scope of the EIR is illegally narrow because it does not include extension of the operating life of DCCP. The scope of the EIR must include analysis of continued operation of DCCP from 2014 to 2025. Other resource agencies are being given incomplete information due to the narrow scope of the project. • New issues and information including new seismic data, enhanced security needs, retirement eligibility of a large fraction of DCCP workers during project, NRC license renewal, and degradation of coastal waters should be considered in a new scope for the EIR. • The EIR should include NRC filings of whistle-blower comments, Labor Department information regarding retaliation against workers, and rate-based filings against PG&E. • The EIR must consider the issue of nuclear waste. • The scope of the EIR should be expanded to include the public's comments. • The CPUC, Attorney General, and Utilities had secret meetings in which rate-based issues were discussed, and excluded the general public from the process by stating that they were not rate-based. Ratepayers deserve better treatment from the CPUC. • Water quality issues at DCCP due to the cooling water system are a concern. DCCP currently operates under an administrative extension from the RWQCB because their five-year NPDES permit was not approved due to improper mitigation measures. U.S. EPA recently passed more stringent regulations, (316(a) and 316(b)), controlling power plants outflow of thermal cooling water. These new regulations and DCCP's existing expired permit should be considered. • Seismic data is evolving, and there is new information since 1991. The currently available data and technology is much more advanced than that available at the time of DCCP's construction.

Appendix B-3. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 27, 2004 Evening Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The seismicity danger today is greater than what was originally assumed. In order to achieve the original degree of safety, the cost will be much greater. However ignoring this new seismic information will be costly for PG&E ratepayers.• Two major earthquakes have recently occurred that were centered near DCP, however not much more seismic work has been completed.• PG&E geologists are performing seismic studies that are valuable and should be incorporated into the EIR document and made available to the public. Additionally, the EIR should be peer-reviewed by an independent party.• PG&E has denied, and then minimized the existence of offshore seismic issues.• PG&E has revised their testing to ignore seismic upgrades.• Confirm that DCP can withstand potential seismic events given the new information.• The 'No Project' alternative must find alternative power generation sources. Some of these alternatives could include 're-purposing' of the DCP facility, which would allow the reuse or conversion of the facility's infrastructure for a natural gas combined cycle power plant.• Private money should be used to finance alternatives using clean energy such as wind power.• The 'No Project' alternative should consider alternative energy and renewable energy sources such as solar and wind power.• The 'No Project' alternatives should utilize the long-term energy plans developed by the CPUC and PG&E, as well as the California Energy Action Plan. These documents are good resources to identify better alternatives that include environmental issues and cost.• Replacement of DCP power with alternative energy generation sources could include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 500 MW natural gas facility;▪ 266 MW of electricity conservation;▪ 50 MW from wind power (creates three jobs);▪ 17 MW from solar power (1 MW creates seven jobs);▪ 10 MW from wave power; and▪ 2 MW from fuel cells.• The 'No Action' alternative should be removed because it is not feasible, and PG&E would not allow this scenario to occur• There is no acceptable means of storing or disposing of spent nuclear fuel, and this must be considered in the document.• Nuclear power poses a health and safety danger through its materials and waste:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Nuclear power plants have depleted uranium which translates into 25% power and 75% waste.▪ Nuclear weapons have killed many people.▪ Nuclear power has potentially catastrophic issues.• Start-up of a nuclear power plant is the most dangerous time, and DCP will be required to start-up again.• The effect to human health and safety due to the lack of storage and safety measures at DCP must be the first priority of this project. There are safety concerns with seismic activity and terrorism, as well as the resulting health concerns due to an accident, and the growing waste dump at DCP due to a lack of feasible and safe storage.• There are numerous concerns with marine entrainment and impingement, loss of marine habitat, and loss or decreasing density of marine species. This is supported by California Department of Fish and Game stating that there has been loss and degradation of habitat and species. Also the California Coastal Commission has stated that mitigation measures are not sufficient to mitigate the impacts to marine and coastal resources.• The 'human factor' must be considered in this document, especially with regards to the DCP evacuation plan. There are 6,000 men at the Lompoc Men's Colony that are within Zone 2 that have no evacuation plan.• The current disaster plan is inadequate as there are some people in the community that are considered "accepted casualties" as there are no evacuation plans for them.• The DCP warning sirens are not able to be heard in some locations, and this would not allow

Appendix B-3. Summary of Oral Comments Received at October 27, 2004 Evening Scoping Meeting

Date	Comments/Questions
	<p data-bbox="467 275 824 304">sufficient warning to some residents.</p> <ul data-bbox="440 310 1438 829" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="440 310 1438 373">• Cultural resources are a concern, especially to the Chumash who spoke out against the construction of DCP in 1962 due to the existence of burial sites at the DCP facility site.<li data-bbox="440 380 1438 436">• The extension of life seems inevitable as logically no power plant would be built to operate for only 31 years.<li data-bbox="440 443 1438 499">• The region's industry, especially wineries, and tourism would be negatively affected by an accident at DCP.<li data-bbox="440 506 1438 590">• The Westinghouse steam generators were supposed to last forty years, however they have only lasted half of that time. This reinforces the notion that PG&E does not have a definitive grasp of the technology and equipment at the facility.<li data-bbox="440 596 1036 625">• There should have been more preparation for the meeting.<li data-bbox="440 632 889 661">• The meeting should have been transcribed.<li data-bbox="440 667 1068 697">• The meeting was timed poorly as the election is a week away.<li data-bbox="440 703 1344 760">• There is disappointment that CPUC staff including the project manager, Commissioner, or Administrative Law Judge did not attend the meeting.<li data-bbox="440 766 1133 795">• The credibility of PG&E, CPUC, and the contractors was questioned.<li data-bbox="440 802 1036 831">• Do not be swayed by political or economic considerations. <p data-bbox="440 842 553 871"><u>Questions</u></p> <ul data-bbox="440 877 1438 1110" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="440 877 1438 934">• Can DCP continue to use ocean water for cooling under their currently expired NPDES permit and the recently passed EPA regulations?<li data-bbox="440 940 1328 970">• How much more damage is likely to be done due to PG&E performing 'cheap' mitigation.<li data-bbox="440 976 1279 1005">• How can you determine good alternatives without considering the economic issues?<li data-bbox="440 1012 1377 1041">• Can the CPUC assure the ratepayers that there will be sufficient review of new seismic data?<li data-bbox="440 1047 1360 1077">• PG&E can not predict future seismic activity, so how can they not make seismic upgrades?<li data-bbox="440 1083 873 1113">• What is the true cost of operating DCP?
